

C. I. A.

EXPOSED

An account of the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency
of the United States of America with special reference to Cuba.

By

S. P. VENKATARAMAN



NEW LITERATURE

1, Marina Arcade, Post Box No. 206

NEW DELHI.

PUBLISHER'S NOTE

We are glad to publish this new pamphlet which in a way is a continuation of our previous pamphlet **THE US OVER LATIN AMERICA**. The aim of our last pamphlet was to expose the activities of American Imperialism in Latin American Countries.

The present pamphlet deals with the nature and activities of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), which the American monopolists have organised in order to subvert democratic governments of the nations refusing to tow the line laid down by Washington. The recent invasion of Cuba by the Cuban exiles, was wholly organised and financed by the Central Intelligence Agency.

The CIA headed by Allen Dulles has always pursued the policy of creating world tension and bringing the world to the brink of disaster. It has adopted the policy of McCarthyism on international scale.

We hope that this pamphlet would acquaint the readers with the activities of this dangerous Agency.

BEST COPY

AVAILABLE

C.I.A. Exposed

Two recent international events have exposed the great menace which the world faces today from an agency of the Government of the United States of America - the Central Intelligence Agency. In this age, when the two big powers of the world and their allies are armed to the teeth with the latest devices of destruction, when nuclear weapons threaten the existence of humanity, and when war can be unleashed very even by an insane man piloting an aircraft carrying these weapons, the problem posed by the functioning of the Central Intelligence Agency, is a problem not only for the Government of the United States of America, but also for other nations and indeed for all peoples interested in maintaining peace in the world.

India's Concern

A recent editorial in an Indian newspaper has sharply drawn attention to some of these facts and it is evident that a great concern exists today in India about the C.I.A. and its method of operation. Commenting on the Agency, the *Times of India* echoed the feeling of the Indian people in general when it said :

"So soon after the Cuban fiasco in which the Agency played a dominant and in fact a role, even the possibility of the C.I.A.'s involvement in Algeria is most disturbing. It cannot be too emphatically an American's fear since, unfortunately, the United States does or pretends to do everything that the Soviet Union does or pretends which no one can help to do."

Notwithstanding the C.I.A. has been frustrating and obstructing the efforts even of its own government, the newspaper further wrote in its leading article :

"Both Cuba and Algeria suggest that the C.I.A.'s obsessive concern with communism has engaged it to evoke a crisis in its own and indeed to stir judgement over its own behaviour and that of the U.S. It is both ridiculous and dangerous."

The *Times of India*, New Delhi, 17 May 1961, p. 10. The title of the editorial is "C.I.A. and the World".

The *Times of India*, 17 May 1961.

of America. In Western Europe in particular, the menace of the C.I.A. is being increasingly felt. The countries in this region have learnt to their cost that it is this Agency and not the State Department which counts in Washington. In the last few years, the Agency has planned disorders and counter-revolutions, has helped the enemies of governments which are not totally with the United States of America, has tried to undermine and sabotage the structure of every freedom loving government and, what is more, has even intervened openly in the affairs of other peoples. Reporting from London, the well-known commentator, Paula Wiking, said after the Cuban invasion:

"There is serious concern here over the potential dangers of the Cuban situation. British public opinion is extremely sceptical of Kennedy's disclaimer of any American involvement in the attack on Cuba. Even papers otherwise strongly pro-American are now freely admitting the sinister role played by the Central Intelligence Agency directed by Allen Dulles. This organisation which almost stands above government, has maintained a steady stream of propaganda and subversion against Castro. No one doubts that much of the financing and other support for the Cuban rebels inside the U.S.A. and many other parts of the hemisphere has come from the C.I.A. With it have come the signs of a revival of some degree of McCarthyism."

Challenging the Statement made by the US Secretary of States, Dean Rusk, that the people of America "are against Castro," a full page advertisement in the *New York Times* inserted by the "Fair Play for Cuba Committee" said.

"Rusk cannot speak for the American people in this matter. Neither can the C.I.A. Allen Dulles, wrapped in the toga of security, has made himself as unassailable as the Director of the F.B.I. Congress has surrendered its functions to conspirators; and the State Department lacking a policy, has placed our country in the hands of the cloak and dagger boys."

The Cuban Folly

The C.I.A.'s hand in the Cuban invasion has been clearly exposed by Cuba's Foreign Minister Raul Roa in the following words:

"Could the U.S. delegate deny that training camps under American experts had been established in Florida? Could the U.S. deny that it has supported mercenaries, that hundreds of planes had left Florida to burn Cuban sugar

fields or that the U.S.A. had given sanctuary to Batista war criminals? Could the U.S. deny that the Central Intelligence Agency was spending \$500,000 per month as reported in the *Times*, *Newsweek* and *Baltimore Sun*, on the rebels."

The mentality behind the C.I.A.'s conspiracy in Latin America was well brought out by the American columnist, Max Lerner:

"The case of the U.S. is a good first, and with it the related case of the whole of Latin America. It is the American 'Tory dream' that Castro can be driven out of the hemisphere by a brilliant array of arms, and by a regrouping of the old Batista forces in what would have to be (for want of any other resource) a massive invasion backed by American ships and planes. It is also the American Tory dream that while the United States is planning this or seeking to carry it out, the other Latin American Governments will cheer wildly, and their deeply discontented peasants and workers and students will enthusiastically back up the brave Yankee, who would (under Tory leadership) stand for none of the nonsense of a welfare state in their own country, or economic aid to bolster welfare states anywhere in the hemisphere."*

Whose Policy?

This mentality of American reaction which worries and distresses liberals like Lerner, is really the manifestation of one aspect of American life. Tremendous control over politics is exerted by big business who in their turn have a vital stake in Latin America and particularly Cuba. Confident of victory as soon as the invasion had started, American capitalists operated in the stock market of New York. The *New York Herald Tribune* reported on 18th April 1961:

"On the New York stock exchange, Cuba's \$5,000,000 bond issue, in defaults since January 1, started 7 points in heavy trading. At the end of the day investors were paid \$930 for a \$1,000 bond; earlier in the year the price fell as low as \$535. United Fruit Company stock rose 1/8; American Sugar and Refining up 1; Cuban American Sugar up 3 and Atlantic Del Golfo up 3 1/2."

It is of these companies—the tycoons of America—that the C.I.A. is an agent and the anti-democratic role of the C.I.A. within the American State is exposed by the fact that it has been

* *Index*, *Newsweek*, 12th April 1961.

trying to hustle the American Government into dangerous actions in order to forestall any liberalisation in politics in the United States and prevent any improvement in America's relations with the Communist world.

Sequence of Events

One can construct from the stories appearing in various American, British and French journals, the sequence of events in regard to Cuba. It has been the tradition of the C.I.A. under Allen Dulles to sabotage any peace move or to spoil any improved international atmosphere through planned outbursts in several parts of the world. According to the Havana correspondent of the weekly *Blitz*:

"Whenever there has been a chance of lessening tensions in the world leading to some detente between the East and West, the cloak and dagger agents of Allen Dulles swing into action. They staged the civil war in Korea, they engulfed Viet-Nam in a blood bath, they painted the streets of Budapest with Hungarian blood, they propped up the Kasavubu-Tshombe gang to murder Lumumba and they prepared the conspiracy which has miserably failed to liquidate Fidel Castro. Allen Dulles acts when the United States moves towards an understanding with the Soviet Union. When Eisenhower in the last lap of his term went to Paris for the summit, Dulles wrecked mankind's hope by sending the U-2 American spy plane right into the heart of the Soviet Union."*

This is the background in which the sequence of events have to be understood. The C.I.A. has obviously been feeling nervous ever since the advent of President Kennedy to power because it fears that Kennedy is serious about his pronouncements that he would bring back the Rooseveltian era in America. In order to force the hands of Kennedy, the C.I.A. began to plan events in Laos and in the Congo and succeeded in bringing about the most difficult international situations in these two areas. Allen Dulles struck at Cuba, knowing that this was the blind spot of the American Government. The invasion plan was actually drawn up during the Eisenhower regime and one of the first tasks of the Kennedy regime was to decide whether the invasion should be launched or not. Torn between the advice given to him by politicians like Dean Rusk and Chester Bowles and Adlai Stevenson, on the one hand, and the Agency operatives headed by Allen Dulles, on the other, Kennedy was in a fix. The battle was won by the adversaries of the new

* *Blitz*, 29th April 1961

Kennedy team who were entrenched in the American Government and could not be dislodged. Historically, inevitable reverses of America in places like Laos, made them desperate and the young President was swayed by the argument that in the face of sharply declining America's prestige abroad, something had to be done to demonstrate her might. When the Soviet space man Gagarin came back to earth, the green signal was given. If space could not be reached, Cuba certainly was only 70 miles away !

The moment the action was undertaken, it began to be revealed in the Western press as to how this great folly could have been perpetrated. James Reston, the famous columnist of the *New York Times* wrote :

"He (President Kennedy) did so against the advice of Secretary of State, Rusk and Under Secretary, Chester Bowles. He did so on the basis of an intelligent estimate by the Central Intelligence Agency which was convinced that Cuba was ripe for revolt."

What is the C.I.A. ?

What is the C.I.A. ? And who are the main persons behind its operations ? The answer can best be given in the words of the *New York Times* :

"The C.I.A. organised in 1947 and headed since 1953 by Allen W. Dulles makes no public accounting of its activities. It is believed, however, to have more than 10,000 full time employees and to spend several hundred million dollars annually. The Agency does two distinct kinds of work. One is to gather and evaluate information (a task also performed by the State Department and by the military intelligence services). The other C.I.A. job entails so-called 'black' or 'undercover operations'."

It is evident that in so far as the task of the collection of information is concerned, the C.I.A. performs some special kind of job, for, there are two other organisations for the normal spying work. It is also no secret that the C.I.A. is the main agency of sabotage and subversion in other countries. The 'black' operations are apparently the kind of operations which lead to such monstrous adventures as was enacted in Cuba. The exact nature of the activities of the C.I.A. was well brought out in a short article in the American journal *Newsweek* :

"For its many operations around the globe the C.I.A. has more than 15,000 members; but only four are publicly acknowledged, Allen W. Dulles has been Director since 1953. His deputy is Air Force Gen. Charles P. Cabel, who

played a key role in the U-2 flights. In charge of cloak and dagger work, radio monitoring and writing reports for the President, is Robert Amory Jr. Richard M. Bissel Jr., an economist, directs operations that include aerial missions, Guerrilla warfare and propaganda.

In an editorial on the subject in its issue of 12th May 1961, the *New Statesman* has drawn attention to some of the facts about the C.I.A. :

"Since the late 1940's the United States has deliberately chosen to use subversion. The C.I.A. not only gathers intelligence but employs 20,000 operatives overseas. It claims a number of shady successes : the overthrow of Mossadeq in Persia and of Arbenz in Guatemala; more recently the disposal of Patrice Lumumba. Against these must be counted some notorious failures, which have brought humiliation to the West and peril to the world—Laos, the U-2 affair and Cuba."

Citadel of Reaction

It is evident that the C.I.A. is a government within a government and hardly controllable by anyone. What makes it particularly dangerous is the fact that it has its own understanding or misunderstanding of world politics, it follows its own policies and stands for the protection of the extreme right-wing in any country. This implies its total opposition to any left, liberal or even moderately right-wing Government.

To quote the *Newsweek* again :

".....the C.I.A. once given an assignment, on occasion has exhibited an astonishing inaptitude in carrying it out. The basic reason is that the C.I.A. tendency to support the most militant anti-communist is built into the system..... The result is that the system tends to make the U.S. clandestine allies of reaction says a former C.I.A. man who now holds an elective office. When it comes to recommendations about politics the safe project is to support the element which is most anti-communist."

As the *New Statesman* noted :

".....in attempting to subvert suspect left-wing regimes—or to bolster reliable ones—the C.I.A. has identified the West with the most reprehensible elements of feudal privilege and reaction."

The political inclinations of the C.I.A. were clear from the way it managed the Cuban invasion; not only was the Castro

regime to be thrown out by invasion, it was only the extreme right among the American mercenaries who were to take over. Those with whom the C.I.A. did not agree faced a similar fate as what Castro supporters would have faced had the C.I.A. succeeded. Here is the report of the *New York Times*:

"On the day of the landings in Cuba of the anti-Castro forces, members of the Cuban Revolutionary Council were kept incommunicado by the Central Intelligence Agency in an official house near Miami, the official sources acknowledged today. They described the action as a security measure."

What was behind the security measure? Whose security was involved? Again to quote the *Times*:

"...the C.I.A. favoured the rightists among the exiles (including supporters of the old Batista dictatorship)..."

This aspect of the Cuban plot was well brought out by the *New York Times* in an editorial on the 28th April:

"To those who know the situation in Cuba and knew the formidable strength of the leaders and their regime, the outcome of such an invasion plot was inevitable. And even if it had succeeded, the C.I.A. concept of putting in a right wing Government that would have been branded as a yankee creation, was dreadfully wrong."

It is this that the C.I.A. has been doing all over the world. In Laos, the *Newsweek* states:

"The C.I.A. decided to support the power of Gen. Phoumi Nosavan, solely on the ground that he was strong: anti-Communist. He was...but the C.I.A. entirely overlooked the fact that he was also thoroughly corrupt and that his army was in effect almost entirely worthless."

Brinkmanship

Not in Laos alone has the C.I.A. played such mischief. The Agency has been responsible for the U-2 flight, for the dangerous espionage attempts in Berlin and virtually for all such American activities which brought humanity to the brink of disaster. The world has frequently been brought by the C.I.A. to the verge of total annihilation for because of mad anti-Communist schemings and plottings. It can also be said without fear of contradiction that the C.I.A. has been at its game in the neutral countries. In fact, the *Newsweek* while summing up its activities has said:

"C.I.A. must have information readily available on all peoples behind the iron curtain, in neutral countries, in allied countries and in the U.S. too."

The worst manifestation of the C.I.A. has been in the Algerian episode. The French daily *Le Monde* openly stated in one of its issues (as quoted by the *Manchester Guardian*):

"It appears established that some American agents more or less encouraged Maurice Challe, whose experience in N.A.T.O. should have been able to put him on guard against the dealings of these irresponsible, and their Spanish or German confederates. Mr. Kennedy obviously had nothing to do with this affair. To make this plain, he considered it necessary to offer aid to General de Gaulle—well intentioned certainly but inopportune."

The *Paris Presse* claimed that Mr. Macmillan, the British Prime Minister warned President Kennedy against giving the slightest impression that any one in authority in the United States was giving the rebel generals moral support. The C.I.A. denial that they were not involved in the Algerian affair did not convince anyone. The *Times of India* rightly said:

"Despite Mr. Allen Dulles's denial he could hardly be expected to confirm so damaging a charge—the uncomfortable impression persists that in some devious way, unknown to the Kennedy administration itself the uprising was if not entirely inspired, at least abetted by the C.I.A."

Mr. Dulles, the Super-Spy

And who can take Mr. Allen Dulles at his word? He started his career as an ordinary spy. As the *Newsweek* puts it:

"Dulles unquestionably understands the deep motives and the bizarre concerns of the professional spy, for he has been an espionage agent himself—and a very good one."

No wonder the C.I.A. headed by the master spy has little knowledge of politics and overplays its hand everywhere. It is bad for the foreign policy of a big power to be formulated by its bureaucrats, but it is infinitely worse for it to be formulated by spies. In the United States of America today the spies determine what to do in a given situation, whom to support in a given country, how to react to international developments and where to strike for the furtherance of America's national interests as defined by the master brain of the master spy—Allen W. Dulles.

This is a matter of concern for all Americans as indeed the liberal press in the United States has very strongly pointed out.

But it is also a concern for all other peoples of the world. Francis Powers has been punished but the real culprits, as the defence counsel for the spy pointed out, are still active. The demand for the scuttling of the C.I.A. is, therefore, the demand of peace-loving forces all over the world.

Enquiry By Maxwell

President Kennedy has ordered an enquiry into the C.I.A.'s working. The enquiry would be conducted by Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, former Army Chief of Staff (who is heading the enquiry) and he will be assisted by Robert Kennedy, the President's brother and the Attorney General and Admiral Burke, Chief of Naval Operations. Also among those who will assist would be the formidable spy, Allen W. Dulles.

Such an enquiry is welcome and the case for this has indeed been ably put in the *New York Times*. Writing under the heading *Reapprising the C.I.A.* (26.4.1961) it wrote :

"The appointment of a man with qualifications of Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor to review United States intelligence services and para-military activities suggests the seriousness of President Kennedy's determination to find out what went wrong in the intelligence operations that led up to the Cuban fiasco of last week. The implication is that changes in the functioning of the Central Intelligence Agency, its status and its personnel are contemplated.

"We have long supported Senator Mike Mansfield of Montana, now the Majority Leader, in his contention that the Congress should have greater control over the C.I.A., which, though it spends vast sums of money, is virtually a law unto itself subject only to Presidential direction. By its very nature it must operate in secret; but a 'watchdog committee' such as Mr. Mansfield proposes could serve a useful function without violating security, in much the same way as the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy has, in an equally secret field for years.

"The institution like the C.I.A. should be solely a body to gather intelligence, to weigh it, interpret it if required, but not to make policy decisions. It was not intended to make policy, which in the field of foreign affairs, is the prerogative of the President working through the State Department. Yet in the case of Cuba, for instance, the C.I.A.'s insistence on backing one group and excluding another was a policy decision, and a mistaken one at that."

Scuttle the C.I.A.

Is it enough to hold an enquiry into the functioning of this dangerous Agency? Is it enough to change its personnel? Apparently not. For, as the *Newsweek* says, the C.I.A.'s political functioning is built within the system itself. Time and again, it has been demonstrated that the C.I.A. can lead to extremely dangerous situations and can in the interest of the extreme right-wing in American politics attempt to sabotage even the Government's declared policies. What is needed, therefore, is something more and one can only quote the *Times of India* for this:

"Mr. Kennedy has reactivated a special Presidential board presumably to control the activities of the C.I.A. But something very much more basic than a watchdog is surely required. A state of affairs in which one section of the Administration must constantly guard against the indiscretions of another, can hardly yield purposeful results. A competitive and extremely dangerous relationship with the Communist bloc demands the utmost concentration of effort and a high degree of co-ordination. If the C.I.A. has in any sense to be watched, it is a serious handicap which the United States can do better without. It is by no means unusual for a government to maintain an elaborate intelligence organisation; what is abnormal is that such an organisation should function independently of or contrary to the policies of the government which it is supposed to serve. Both Cuba and Algeria suggest that the C.I.A.'s obsessive concern with Communism has engaged it to evolve a policy of its own and indeed to sit in judgment over the policies of the administration itself. That is both ridiculous and dangerous and cannot be controlled by simply establishing a Presidential board; it is an attitude of mind that must be thoroughly uprooted if the Kennedy Administration is to deal effectively with the many crises by which it is likely to be challenged."

The C.I.A. was created when the cold war was developing. Mr. Allen Dulles came to head it at the peak of the cold war when his brother was in charge of the foreign policy of the United States of America. The world has changed considerably since then. The old Dullesian approach has been found to be thoroughly inadequate to meet the needs of the times and a reappraisal of the foreign policy itself has been forced on the United States of America. The great question to be faced today is whether out of this reappraisal the United States would move towards what Kennedy has promised—the Rooseveltian approach—or it will lead to a relapse into even more harsh cold war attitudes and the implementation of Dulles policy with

vengeance. The United States apparently faces this vital question today and the policies of the new Administration have indicated that it is vacillating between these two trends. There are powerful forces within the United States of America which will obstruct and frustrate any attempts to readjust American policies.

In fact, there are too many agencies with vested interests in the status quo of cold war, tension and conflict. The C.I.A. is symbolic of these forces, just as many of the liberals whom Kennedy has succeeded in getting around him are symbols of the other trend. The outcome of this tussle would be watched with great interest all over the world. In fact, a serious concern exists everywhere about this and with fingers crossed, the people of the world wait for the results. Jawaharlal Nehru, the Prime Minister of this country, had long back said that the world is living under a suspended sentence of death. If the tussle in the United States is won by the C.I.A. and its supporters, the suspended sentence may at last be executed. The hope would, therefore, be expressed everywhere that not only will this tussle be resolved in favour of the forces of liberalisation but also that America will be able to liquidate its own creations. The fate of the C.I.A. after the enquiry to be conducted would be the crucial test of which way the United States moves.

One of the greatest problems of modern politics is that in the context of the acute cold war, agencies have been created which have become more powerful than their creators. It is a problem of administration and government to get rid of the control of these agencies and to re-establish the overall control of political leaders over bureaucratic machineries. It will be a grossly lop-sided view of the situation, however, to imagine that the problem can be resolved only by administrative or structural changes in the governmental apparatus. The problem of controlling such agencies as the C.I.A. is very much interlinked ultimately with the problem of reducing international tensions, of mitigating the cold war and of ushering in an era of peaceful co-existence. The two events which have so sharply brought out the dangers inherent in allowing agencies like the C.I.A. to function freely, have also underlined the need for such co-existence and easing of the cold-war. The status and character of the C.I.A. is a reflection of the foreign policy goals and objectives of the United States of America. Simultaneously, therefore, with the over-due curbing of the influence of the C.I.A., ways and means must be found of approaching the large problems. If the big powers of the world would decide to co-exist, agencies like the C.I.A. would become redundant. This is not to argue that the C.I.A. can be curbed only when co-existence has been assured. There is a vicious circle of fear in the world

today, leading to tension and armaments, and armaments and tension leading to further fear. Likewise, there is a vicious circle of the C.I.A. leading to tension and tension leading to further strengthening of the C.I.A. If an attempt is to be made to break this vicious circle, obviously it can be made by such actions as the re-establishment of American political control over its military and intelligence organisations. It can also be said that apart from the international aspects of the question, the increasing and mounting influence of such agencies on vital policies is a threat to the very structure of government and politics in the United States of America and it is no accident that liberal Americans have strongly voiced their criticism of the C.I.A. and demanded that it should be placed in its proper position. Opinions in the rest of the world will sympathise with this and hope that the voice of reason will prevail over the voice of un-Intelligence.

TRANSMITTAL SLIP		DATE
TO: Mr. Warner		10/6/61
ROOM NO.	BUILDING	
REMARKS:		
<p>This was in the clipping book Gagan has no extra copies so we ran a theme. Suggest we file with Cuba vs. CIA, the Nation article etc</p>		
FROM:		
ROOM NO.	ON	

FORM NO. 241
1 FEB 55

REPLACES FORM 36-8
WHICH MAY BE USED.

GPO : 1967-O-439445

(47)

25X1